

Saihu: A Common Interface of Worst-Case Delay Analysis Tools for Time-Sensitive Networks

Chun-Tso Tsai*, Seyed Mohammadhossein Tabatabaee, Stéphan Plassart,
Jean-Yves Le Boudec

*School of Computer and Communication Sciences,
École Polytechnique Fédérale de Lausanne*

Abstract

Time-sensitive networks, as in the context of IEEE-TSN and IETF-Detnet, require bounds on worst-case delays. Various network analysis tools compute such bounds; these tools are based on different methods and provide delay bounds that are all valid but may differ; furthermore, it is generally not known which tool will provide the best bound. To obtain the best possible bound, users need to implement multiple pieces of code with a different syntax for every tool, which is impractical and error-prone. To address this issue, we present Saihu, a Python interface that integrates the three most frequently used worst-case network analysis tools: xTFA, DiscoDNC, and Panco. They altogether implement six analysis methods. Saihu provides a general interface that enables defining a network in a single file and executing all tools simultaneously without any modification. Saihu further exports analysis results as formatted reports automatically and allows quick generation of certain types of networks. With its simplified steps of execution, Saihu reduces the burden on users and makes it accessible for anyone working with time-sensitive networks. An introductory video is available at <https://youtu.be/Mi0hLay8Kr4>.

Keywords: Worst-case Delay Analysis, Network Analysis Interface, Network Calculus, Time-Sensitive Networking

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: chun-tso.tsai@epfl.ch (Chun-Tso Tsai),
hossein.tabatabaee@epfl.ch (Seyed Mohammadhossein Tabatabaee),
stephan.plassart@epfl.ch (Stéphan Plassart), jean-yves.leboudec@epfl.ch
(Jean-Yves Le Boudec)

1. Introduction

Time-sensitive networks are used for real-time applications in various automation systems and require bounds on worst-case delays (cf. IEEE-TSN and IETF-Detnet). In such networks, communication flows are required to be constrained at their sources by traffic envelopes, also called arrival curves. The computation of good delay bounds is typically done using network calculus, which abstracts the service offered by a network element by a function called a service curve [1, 2, 3]. Finding the best delay bound, given the arrival curves of flows at the sources and the service curves offered by the nodes, is an NP-hard problem. Therefore, several methods were developed to find good delay bounds. Frequently used methods are Total Flow Analysis (TFA) [4], Separate Flow Analysis (SFA) [2], Pay Multiplexing Only Once (PMOO) [5], Least Upper Delay Bound (LUDB) [6], Polynomial Linear Programming (PLP), and Exponential Linear Programming (ELP) [7]. All methods provide valid delay bounds but differ in their design and implementation, and it is not trivial to identify the best, smallest bound among them. Therefore, for every application case, it is interesting to compare different methods and find the smallest delay bound.

The existing worst-case delay analysis tools, such as xTFA [4], DiscoDNC [6, 8], and Panco [7] (see [9] for more tools), support some of the frequently used methods. These tools altogether cover most of the widely recognizable methods within the community. As of today, despite the great potential of utilizing multiple tools, users must implement multiple pieces of code with different syntaxes for each of them, which is impractical and error-prone.

We present Saihu, **S**uperimposed worst-case delay **A**nalysis **I**nterface for **H**uman-friendly **U**sage, to simplify the whole process. Users can execute analyses and compare the results from each tool easily with a single interface and simple commands. Saihu provides a general interface that enables defining the networks in one XML or JSON file and executing all tools simultaneously without any modification; it automatically generates input for each tool respectively and executes the analyses on them. Saihu can produce analysis results in formatted reports and offer automatic network generation for certain types of networks. Therefore, with its straightforward syntax and ease of execution, Saihu simplifies the worst-case bounds comparisons in time-sensitive networks. Its design is modular and supports the addition of new tools. Fig. 1 illustrates the design of Saihu with its data flow.

2. System Model

Devices represent switches or routers that compose the network of interest; they consist of input ports, output ports, and switching fabric. Fig. 2




Figure 1: Data flow of Saihu




Figure 2: Device model

shows one such device. Each packet enters a device via an input port and is stored in a packetizer. A packetizer releases a packet only when the entire packet is received. Then, the packet goes through a switching fabric, which transmits the packet to a specific output port based on the static route of the packet; the packet is either buffered in a FIFO (First-In-First-Out) queue and then is serialized on the output line at the transmission rate of the line or exits the network via a terminal port (i.e., a sink).

A flow is a stream of packets generated from the same source, following the same path, and destined for the same sink. We assume that flows are statically assigned to a path. A path consists of a source, a sequence of devices (with the corresponding input port and output port), and a sink (see Fig. 3a). For each flow i , we let l_i^{\max} and l_i^{\min} denote the maximum and minimum packet size, respectively. Every flow is constrained at the source by an arrival curve which we assume to be piece-wise linear and concave. Such an arrival curve, say α , can be described by a collection of m rates r_1, r_2, \dots, r_m

and bursts b_1, b_2, \dots, b_m such that $\alpha(t) = \min_{k=1:m}(r_k t + b_k)$; each function $t \mapsto r_k t + b_k$ is called a token-bucket function with rate r_k and burst b_k . The long-term arrival rate of a flow is $\min_k r_k$. Note that the parameters $(m, r_{1:m}, b_{1:m})$ may differ for every flow.

A flow can be either *unicast* (one source, one destination) or *multicast* (one source, multiple destinations). In the latter case, traffic can be split at one or several intermediate devices. For the tools that do not support multicast flows, we replace every multicast flow with p sub-paths by p unicast flows with the same arrival curve constraint at the source; this increases the traffic inside the network, and thus delay bounds that we obtain are valid but might be less good than those obtained by tools that natively support multicast flows.

The service offered to the aggregation of all flows of interest at an output port is represented by a service curve, which we assume to be piecewise linear and convex. Such a service curve, say β , can be described by a collection of n rates R_1, R_2, \dots, R_n and latencies T_1, T_2, \dots, T_n such that $\beta(t) = \max_{k=1:n}(R_k[t - T_k]^+)$, with the notation $[x]^+ = \max(x, 0)$; each function $t \rightarrow R_k[t - T_k]^+$ is called a rate-latency function with rate R_k and latency T_k . The long-term service rate of the output port is defined as $\max_k R_k$. Note that the parameters $(n, R_{1:n}, T_{1:n})$ may differ at every output port.

We assume that the network is locally stable, namely, at every output port, the aggregate long-term arrival rate (equal to the sum of the long-term arrival rates of all flows using the output port) is less than the long-term service rate. This is a necessary condition for the existence of finite delay bounds; it is also sufficient in feed-forward networks, but not in networks that have cyclic dependencies [2, Chapter 12].

3. Included Tools

Saihu currently includes 3 tools: xTFA, DNC, and Panco. Fig. 1 summarizes supported methods for each tool.

Method\Tool	DNC	xTFA	Panco
TFA	V	V	V
SFA	V		V
PLP			V
ELP			V
PMOO	V		
LUDB	V		

Table 1: Supported methods are marked with a “V”




Figure 3: Physical and output port network examples

- **xTFA** [4] is developed in Python and supports a more advanced TFA. For its input, an XML file describes the network (cf. Sec. 4.1.1). xTFA supports analyzing networks with cyclic dependency and multicast flows.
- **DiscoDNC** [8] is developed in Java and partially uses linear programming with *CPLEX* [10] for LUDB. It supports TFA, SFA, PMOO, and LUDB. A network is defined through its own Java classes. Saihu uses the information from an output port network to create a network in DNC syntax internally. Moreover, with DNC, one cannot manually set shaping with FIFO multiplexing but only with arbitrary multiplexing. Also, DNC does not support networks with cyclic dependency and does not support multicast flows (see Section 2).
- **Panco** [7] is developed in Python and uses linear programming. So, it requires *lpsolve* [11] to execute TFA, SFA, PLP, and ELP. A network is described with its own Python classes. Saihu internally creates the network in Panco syntax from the information of an output port network. All methods of Panco except for ELP support networks with cyclic dependencies. Panco does not support multicast flows (see Section 2).

4. Software Description

Saihu’s analyses are done in 3 steps: describe a network to be analyzed (Sec. 4.1); execute analyses with selected tools (Sec. 4.2); and export analysis reports back to the user (Sec. 4.3).

4.1. Network Description File

Saihu allows the user to write a network in either a *physical network* or an *output port network* format. Examples are shown in Fig. 3. Briefly speaking, a physical network represents the physical connections between multiple switches and stations and flows that travel through different input and output ports of switches; it represents the view of a real-world network. On the other hand, as a physical network includes more than enough information,

we provide the output port network format as a simplified form to define a network. As the queuing is only on output ports even if we provide full network information, we only describe output ports as service units instead of the entire device.

To allow easy access to the tool, we provide both physical and output port networks as available input file forms. People may prefer to directly write in the physical network format to avoid the translation to an output port format, and some people may prefer the output port network to write a network concisely. While xTFA takes a physical network as an XML file and the others parse from an output port network as a JSON file, one can choose the format they prefer to define a network as Saihu automatically converts a file when needed.

4.1.1. Option 1: Physical Network in XML

A physical network is written as an XML file in the same format as in xTFA, and at least contains **General network information**, **Servers**, **Links**, and **Flows**. Listing. 1 demonstrates a minimal example.

```

<network name="demo" technology="FIFO+IS" minimum-packet-size="50B"/>
<station name="src0"/>
<switch name="s0" service-latency="10us" service-rate="4Mbps"/>
<station name="sink0"/>
<link name="src0-s0" from="src0" to="s0" fromPort="o0" toPort="i0"/>
<link name="s0-sink0" from="s0" to="sink0" fromPort="o0" toPort="i0"
  transmission-capacity="10Mbps"/>
<flow name="f0" arrival-curve="leaky-bucket" lb-burst="10B" lb-rate="10
  kbps" maximum-packet-size="50B" source="src0">
  <target>
    <path node="s0"/>
    <path node="sink0"/>
  </target>
</flow>

```

Listing 1: Example of a physical network representation

First, one **network** element defines the general network information as its attributes: the network's name (**name**), analysis parameters concatenated by the plus sign (**technology**, IS stands for *Input Shaping*), and optionally some default value (e.g. **minimum-packet-size**) across the network.

Second, a server can be either a **station** or a **switch** representing a physical node. Although they are physically different, they both serve as service-providing devices in our tools as mentioned in Sec. 2, or sources/sinks of a data flow. The service parameters **service-latency** and **service-rate** define a default service curve for all the output ports on this device.

Third, a **link** connects two devices. Saihu tools consider output ports as processing units, so the physical link must be defined **from** a physical node to another node with the input and output ports used by the link. Namely, it goes from an output port of one server to an input port of another server. Since a link directly attaches to an output port, users can define service via a link. The **transmission-capacity** of the link can also be specified to consider line shaping. Without defined values, the system will apply the default values defined at the upper levels (**switch/station** or **network**).

Finally, a **flow** element defines a flow. Flow paths are surrounded by **target** elements, where each node it traverses is listed as a **path** element with its **node** attribute indicating the name of the physical node. In this format, a multicast flow is possible and is obtained by defining multiple **target** elements within the same flow. A token-bucket curve at the source is defined by **arrival-curve**, **lb-burst**, and **lb-rate** keywords. Packetization is considered with maximum and minimum packet sizes. Saihu analyzes all the output ports in the order of the flow path.

4.1.2. Option 2: Output Port Network in JSON

Output port format is designed by the authors to write the network concisely. The file contains at least **General network information**, **Servers**, and **Flows**. An example is shown as Listing 2.

First, a **network** object defines the general network information, the default values, and units throughout the network.

Second, **servers** defines all servers as an array. The parameters can be either a *string* as a number followed by a unit, e.g. "10us" for 10 microseconds; or a *number* that uses the predefined unit. The service curve is taken as the maximum of all rate-latency curves defined in **service_curve** (see Sec. 2). Each rate-latency curve is described by a pair of rate and latency values with the same index. For example, the service curve of server **s0-o0** is derived from 2 rate-latency curves: the first has a 10 microseconds latency and 4 megabits per second rate, and the second has a 1000 microseconds latency and 50 megabits per second rate.

Notice that in the output port network format, we use *graph-induced-by-flows* as the network topology instead of manually defining links. A link between two servers exists only when at least one flow crosses these two servers consecutively. Therefore, the link's transmission capacity attached to an output port is directly defined on a server with the keyword **capacity**.

Finally, **flows** represents the flows as an array. Each flow is defined by a **path** as an array of servers, and an **arrival_curve** at its source. The arrival curve is defined as the minimum of the multiple token-bucket curves with each pair of burst and rate values represents a token-bucket curve (see

```

{
  "network": {
    "name": "demo",
    "multiplexing": "FIFO",
    "rate_unit": "Mbps"
  },
  "servers": [
    {
      "name": "s0-o0",
      "service_curve": {
        "latencies": ["10us", "1ms"],
        "rates": [4, "50Mbps"]
      },
      "capacity": "200Mbps"
    }
  ],
  "flows": [
    {
      "name": "f0",
      "path": ["s0-o0"],
      "arrival_curve": {
        "bursts": ["10B", "2kB"],
        "rates": ["10kbps", 0.5]
      },
      "max_packet_length": "50B",
    }
  ]
}

```

Listing 2: Network information with default values


```
python main.py demo.json -a
```

Listing 3: Use Saihu as command line tool

```
from saihu.interface import TSN_Analyzer
analyzer = TSN_Analyzer("demo.json")
analyzer.analyze_all()
analyzer.export("demo")
```

Listing 4: Use Saihu as package

Sec. 2). For example, `f0`'s arrival curve is composed of a token-bucket curve of burst 10 bytes and rate 10 kilobits per second, and a curve of burst 2 kilobytes and rate 0.5 megabits per second.

All flows written in the output port network format are assumed to be unicast flows. When being converted from a physical network with multicast flows, it separates the paths into multiple unicast flows with the same source and arrival curve (see Section 2).

4.2. Tool Usage

Saihu analysis execution can be done via the command line tool `main.py` or by importing the interface from `interface.py`. We demonstrate the simplest way to analyze a network file, say `demo.json`, with both possibilities. Listing 3 and Listing 4 show two ways to analyze `demo.json` with all the tools and methods available inside Saihu.

Manual selection of tools or methods is possible via specifying different flags in the command line interface, or using different function names as `analyze_xxx`, with the `analyze_all` in the above example representing analyzing with all tools.

4.3. Analysis Reports

Saihu can generate 2 kinds of reports:

1. A *human-friendly report* is generated as a Markdown file that gives the per-flow end-to-end delay, per-server delay, and execution time for each tool. The delay bounds are presented in tables where each row is a flow or a server, and each column is a method executed by a tool. The last column contains the minimum result obtained in the current round of analysis. Fig. 4 demonstrates an example of per-flow end-to-end delay and execution time as a reference.

The report also contains some reminders about the user inputs: network topology using the graph-induced-by-flows (Sec. 4.1.2), flow paths,

and link utilization by nodes. Link utilization is defined as the ratio between the aggregated arrival rate at a node and its service rate.

2. A *machine-friendly report* is written in JSON format for easy parsing from other programs. It stores the execution outputs, i.e. the per-flow end-to-end delay, per-server delay, and execution time. An example is shown in Listing 5. Note that the numbers in a human-friendly report are always rounded to 3 decimal digits while there's no such rounding for a machine-friendly report. As a result, one should read the machine-friendly report if they require a very precise result.

Flow name	Panco-ELP	DNC-LUDB	Panco-PLP	DNC-PMOO	DNC-SFA	xTFA-TFA	Minimum (best)
f0	80.050	80.050	80.050	80.201	80.050	99.324	80.050
f1	80.080	60.050	79.270	60.125	60.050	79.322	60.050
f2	49.280	50.004	49.280	50.201	50.125	49.324	49.280

(a) Flow end-to-end delay.

tool-method	Execution Time
Panco-ELP	123.159
DNC-LUDB	202.000
Panco-PLP	139.048
DNC-PMOO	16.000
DNC-SFA	13.000
xTFA-TFA	5.334

(b) Execution time.

Figure 4: Human-friendly Markdown report

```
{
  "name": "demo",
  "flow_e2e_delay": {
    "f0": {
      "xTFA_TFA": 99.32394489448944,
      "Panco_PLP": 80.05,
      "Panco_ELP": 80.05,
      "DNC_SFA": 80.0501253132832,
      "DNC_PM00": 80.20050125313283,
      "DNC_LUDB": 80.0501253132832
    },
    ...
  },
  "execution_time": {
    "xTFA_TFA": 5.716085433959961,
    "Panco_PLP": 147.26519584655762,
    "Panco_ELP": 129.76408004760742,
    "DNC_SFA": 12.0,
    "DNC_PM00": 9.0,
    "DNC_LUDB": 172.0
  },
  "units": {
    "flow_delay": "us",
    "server_delay": "us",
    "execution_time": "ms"
  }
}
```

Listing 5: JSON report

5. Case Studies

We apply Saihu to common network topologies: Families of tandem, ring, and mesh networks, used for numerical evaluation in the Panco research [7]. Also, it is applied to an industrial-size network that is a test configuration provided by Airbus [12] and is used as a benchmark in several research papers [13, 14, 15]. Please see Appendix A.

This helped us develop Saihu and ensure its applicability to a variety of cases. Note that the obtained results are not the main purpose of this paper, but are only provided for an interested reader in Appendix A. Specifically, the comparison of delay bounds obtained by different methods is not the main purpose of this paper. Rather, Saihu significantly reduces the effort to make such a comparison by providing a general interface to apply three frequently used worst-case delay analyses in a single shot. Hence, it solves the non-trivial problem of finding the best, smallest delay among the supported methods.

6. Impact

Worst-case delay analysis tools are essential to make theoretical network studies applicable to real-world problems. With each tool specializing in particular methods, the aggregation of these tools has great potential to find the best delay bound of a network. Saihu makes executing and comparing these analysis tools easy by encapsulating them into a single interface while hiding the complexity within. It turns a previously tedious multi-platform programming task into a straightforward “write your problem down and press run.” By simplifying the user’s action to analyze a network, Saihu not only eases the work of existing researchers but also makes these tools accessible to a broader audience by requiring a more approachable level of programming skill.

Saihu also serves as a platform for potential network analysis tool developers due to its cross-platform design. Since Saihu provides unified input/output formats, one can extend Saihu to include more tools by parsing one of the unified inputs and feeding the analysis results into the unified output class. Future developers can bridge their new tool to Saihu and allow existing Saihu users to access their tool easily without forcing people to learn a new framework.

7. Conclusion and Extension

We presented Saihu, a Python interface capable of executing multiple network analysis tools easily. It allows users to define a network and retrieve

the analysis results for multiple tools. Its unified input and output layers enable the automation of all the tedious re-interpretation of a network for each tool. Such design not only simplifies many mechanical procedures previously hindering network researchers' works but also helps publicize these useful tools to more potential users due to its simplicity.

Declaration of competing interest

The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

References

- [1] J.-Y. Le Boudec, P. Thiran, Network Calculus: A Theory of Deterministic Queuing Systems for the Internet, Vol. 2050, Springer Science & Business Media, 2001.
- [2] A. Bouillard, M. Boyer, E. Le Corronc, Deterministic Network Calculus: From Theory to Practical Implementation, Wiley-ISTE, 2018.
- [3] R. Zippo, G. Stea, Nancy: An efficient parallel network calculus library, SoftwareX 19 (2022) 101178. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.softx.2022.101178>.
URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S235271102200108X>
- [4] L. Thomas, Analysis of the side-effects on latency bounds of combinations of scheduling, redundancy and synchronization mechanisms in time-sensitive networks, Ph.D. thesis, l'Institut Supérieur de l'Aéronautique et de l'Espace (ISAE-SUPAERO), thèse de doctorat dirigée par Mifdaoui, Ahlem et Le Boudec, Jean-Yves Informatique et Télécommunications Toulouse, ISAE 2022 (2022).
URL <http://www.theses.fr/2022ESAE0041>
- [5] J. B. Schmitt, F. A. Zdarsky, I. Martinovic, Improving performance bounds in feed-forward networks by paying multiplexing only once, in: Messung, Modellierung und Bewertung von Rechen- und Kommunikationssystemen, 2011.
- [6] A. Scheffler, S. Bondorf, Network calculus for bounding delays in feedforward networks of FIFO queueing systems, in: Proc. of the 18th International Conference on Quantitative Evaluation of Systems, QEST

- '21, 2021, pp. 149–167.
 URL https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-030-85172-9_8
- [7] A. Bouillard, Trade-off between accuracy and tractability of network calculus in fifo networks, *Performance Evaluation* 153 (2022) 102250. doi:<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.peva.2021.102250>.
 URL <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0166531621000675>
- [8] S. Bondorf, J. B. Schmitt, The discodnc v2: A comprehensive tool for deterministic network calculus, in: *Proceedings of the 8th International Conference on Performance Evaluation Methodologies and Tools, VALUETOOLS '14, ICST (Institute for Computer Sciences, Social-Informatics and Telecommunications Engineering)*, Brussels, BEL, 2014, p. 44–49. doi:[10.4108/icst.Valuetools.2014.258167](https://doi.org/10.4108/icst.Valuetools.2014.258167).
 URL <https://doi.org/10.4108/icst.Valuetools.2014.258167>
- [9] Wikipedia, List of research or industrial network analysis tools related to network calculus, https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Network_calculus.
- [10] I. I. Cplex, V12. 1: User's manual for cplex, *International Business Machines Corporation* 46 (53) (2009) 157.
- [11] M. Berkelaar, K. Eikland, P. Notebaert, *lpsolve* (May 2004).
 URL <https://lpsolve.sourceforge.net/5.5/>
- [12] J. Grien, *Analyse et évaluation de techniques de commutation ethernet pour l'interconnexion des systèmes avioniques*, 2004.
 URL <https://api.semanticscholar.org/CorpusID:190248144>
- [13] S. M. Tabatabaee, J.-Y. L. Boudec, Deficit round-robin: A second network calculus analysis, in: *2021 IEEE 27th Real-Time and Embedded Technology and Applications Symposium (RTAS)*, 2021, pp. 171–183. doi:[10.1109/RTAS52030.2021.00022](https://doi.org/10.1109/RTAS52030.2021.00022).
- [14] S. M. Tabatabaee, A. Bouillard, J.-Y. Le Boudec, Worst-case delay analysis of time-sensitive networks with deficit round-robin, *IEEE/ACM Trans. Netw.* 32 (3) (2023) 1967–1982. doi:[10.1109/TNET.2023.3332247](https://doi.org/10.1109/TNET.2023.3332247).
 URL <https://doi.org/10.1109/TNET.2023.3332247>

- [15] H. Charara, J.-L. Scharbarg, J. Ermont, C. Fraboul, Methods for bounding end-to-end delays on an afdx network, in: 18th Euromicro Conference on Real-Time Systems (ECRTS'06), 2006, pp. 10 pp.–202. doi:10.1109/ECRTS.2006.15.

Current code version

Nr.	Code metadata description	Information
C1	Current code version	v1
C2	Permanent link to code/repository used for this code version	https://github.com/adfeel220/Saihu-TSN-Analysis-Tool-Integration
C3	Permanent link to Reproducible Capsule	
C4	Legal Code License	MIT License
C5	Code versioning system used	Git
C6	Software code languages, tools, and services used	Python, Java (by DiscoDNC), lp-solve (by Panco), and CPLEX (by <i>LUDB</i> option of DiscoDNC)
C7	Compilation requirements, operating environments & dependencies	Python packages: <code>xTFA</code> , <code>Panco</code> , Python packages <code>numpy</code> , <code>networkx</code> , <code>matplotlib</code> , <code>mdutils</code> , and <code>pulp</code> . Java package: <code>DiscoDNC</code>
C8	If available Link to developer documentation/manual	https://github.com/adfeel220/Saihu-TSN-Analysis-Tool-Integration/blob/main/README.md
C9	Support email for questions	chun-tso.tsai@epfl.ch

Table 2: Code metadata

Appendix A. Numerical Results

We apply Saihu to common network typologies. We provide the numerical results we obtained for these networks. This shows the applicability of Saihu to a variety of cases. Note that the obtained results are not the main purpose of this paper, but are provided for an interested reader.

Appendix A.1. Interleave Tandem Network

An interleave tandem network is illustrated in Figure A.5. Consider a network of n servers, indexed from 0 to $n - 1$. An interleave tandem network has all its servers chained in a line. One flow f_0 goes through all servers from s_0 to s_{n-1} . The flow f_i is $s_{i-1} \rightarrow s_i$ for $i \in [1, n - 1]$. Every flow has the same arrival curve and the same maximum packet length at the source, defined by function arguments `burst`, `arrival_rate`, and `max_packet_length`. Every server has the same service curve and transmission capacity, defined by `latency`, `service_rate`, and `capacity`.




Figure A.5: Interleave tandem network

We apply Saihu to an interleave tandem network of 8 servers with the parameters shown in Table A.3; see Figure A.6. Due to the limitations of each method, the interleave tandem network is the only type of network in our examples that is compatible with all the methods. Such restriction does not relate to Saihu. Rather, it is the complexity of ELP. One can already see it in Figure A.6b. ELP requires minutes to run while most methods return their analysis results within several milliseconds. The choice of applying ELP to networks with only less than 10 nodes is also suggested in the original paper [7].

burst	arrival rate	max packet size	latency	service rate	capacity
32 bits	64 bps	256 bits	10 ms	1 kbps	1 kbps

Table A.3: Parameters of the example interleave tandem network with 8 servers

Even with such a small-scale network, the delay-bound estimations and the runtimes of individual methods can noticeably differ. Such an example shows the importance of Saihu, where the researchers can try out all the available methods to find the best bound relatively easily.

Per flow end-to-end delay bound

Unit in millisecond

Flow name	Panco-ELP	DNC-LUDB	Panco-PLP	DNC-PMOO	DNC-SFA	DNC-TFA	xTFA-TFA	Minimum (best)
f0	352.982	461.440	355.657	383.853	607.931	912.821	371.092	352.982
f1	120.096	120.096	120.096	132.294	155.569	181.280	121.392	120.096
f2	93.007	157.936	93.055	176.311	198.791	221.688	94.883	93.007
f3	93.405	163.078	93.587	183.077	212.567	233.997	95.204	93.405
f4	93.803	168.787	94.011	187.263	224.436	244.280	95.652	93.803
f5	94.201	172.142	94.436	191.102	236.191	254.499	96.104	94.201
f6	94.599	177.745	94.862	194.903	247.940	264.751	96.557	94.599
f7	57.835	148.734	57.879	161.269	227.691	243.046	58.392	57.835

(a) Flow end-to-end delay

Execution Time

Unit in millisecond

tool-method	Execution Time
Panco-ELP	163770.219
DNC-LUDB	35242.000
Panco-PLP	338.255
DNC-PMOO	31.000
DNC-SFA	116.000
DNC-TFA	39.000
xTFA-TFA	18.891

(b) Execution time

Figure A.6: Analysis report of interleave tandem network with 8 servers

Appendix A.2. Ring Network

A ring network is illustrated in Figure A.7. There are n flows and n servers. The path of flow i is $s_i \rightarrow s_{i+1} \rightarrow \dots \rightarrow s_{i+n-1 \bmod n}$ for $0 \leq i \leq n-1$. A ring network is completely symmetrical with identical flows and servers. An arrival curve of every flow is defined by `burst`, `arrival_rate`, and `max_packet_length`. Also, a service curve of every server is defined by `latency`, `service_rate`, and `capacity`.




Figure A.7: Ring network

We apply Saihu to a ring network of 10 servers with the parameters shown in Table A.4; see Figure A.8. As the ring network has cyclic dependencies, we can only apply the methods PLP and xTFA.

burst	arrival rate	max packet size	latency	service rate	capacity
32 bits	64 bps	256 bits	10 ms	10 kbps	10 kbps

Table A.4: Parameters of the example ring network with 10 servers

Per flow end-to-end delay bound

Unit in millisecond

Flow name	Panco-PLP	xTFA-TFA	Minimum (best)
f0	132.941	134.218	132.941
f1	132.953	134.218	132.953
f2	132.963	134.218	132.963
f3	132.972	134.218	132.972
f4	132.979	134.218	132.979
f5	132.985	134.218	132.985

Execution Time

Unit in millisecond

tool-method	Execution Time
Panco-PLP	78410.769
xTFA-TFA	401.645

(a) Flow end-to-end delay (only the first 5 flows)

(b) Execution time

Figure A.8: Analysis report of a ring network with 10 servers

Appendix A.3. Mesh Network

A mesh network is illustrated in Figure A.9. All flows start from either s_0 or s_1 . The flows go through all $2^{(n-1)/2}$ possible combinations of servers towards the right, e.g. $s_0 \rightarrow s_2 \rightarrow \dots$ and $s_1 \rightarrow s_2 \rightarrow \dots$ are both in the network. All servers have the same service curve and capacity except s_{n-1} , that has the doubled service rate. All flows have identical service curves and maximum packet length.




Figure A.9: Mesh network. Only parts of the flows from s_0 are shown. There is a flow for every possible path from s_0 or s_1 to s_{n-1} .

We apply Saihu to a mesh network of 13 servers with the parameters shown in Table A.5. We do not apply ELP because the number of flows is too large to handle. One can see the report in Figure A.10. Note that the complexity of SFA, LUDB, and PLP can still become intractable in a small-size network.

burst	arrival rate	max packet size	latency	service rate	capacity
32 bits	64 bps	256 bits	10 ms	20 Mbps	200 Mbps

Table A.5: Parameters of the example mesh network with 13 servers

Per flow end-to-end delay bound

Unit in millisecond

Flow name	DNC-LUDB	Panco-PLP	DNC-PMOO	DNC-SFA	DNC-TFA	xTFA-TFA	Minimum (best)
fl_0	70.266	70.216	70.252	70.371	70.380	70.361	70.216
fl_1	70.266	70.238	70.252	70.371	70.380	70.361	70.238
fl_2	70.266	70.240	70.252	70.371	70.380	70.361	70.240
fl_3	70.266	70.263	70.252	70.371	70.380	70.361	70.252
fl_4	70.266	70.240	70.252	70.371	70.380	70.361	70.240
fl_5	70.266	70.263	70.252	70.371	70.380	70.361	70.252

(a) Flow end-to-end delay (only the first 5 flows)

Execution Time

Unit in millisecond

tool-method	Execution Time
DNC-LUDB	5852796.000
Panco-PLP	100257.303
DNC-PMOO	440.000
DNC-SFA	184410.000
DNC-TFA	339.000
xTFA-TFA	458.170

(b) Execution time

Figure A.10: Analysis report of a mesh network with 13 servers

Appendix A.4. Industrial-Sized Network

Saihu is applied to an industrial-size network topology provided by *Airbus* as a test configuration [13, 15]; please see Figure A.11.




Figure A.11: Industrial network from Airbus test configuration [15]. Each connection represents a potential link and the boxes with *S* combined with a number represent switches.

We tested the network by randomly generating 120 flows within this network. The parameters are selected uniformly randomly from the range shown in Table A.6; see Figure A.12. Due to the limited space here, we present the first 5 flows out of 120. We only apply the methods xTFA and PLP to this network because of the cyclic dependencies.

As the number of flows increases, the complexity of PLP grows significantly. We understand real-world networks often contain thousands of flows, but we are constrained by the limitation of our computational resources. Nevertheless, Saihu provides a convenient interface for researchers. Even when the analysis options are limited by the network characteristics or the computational resources, Saihu helps researchers apply a suitable analysis method to their network of interest with relative ease.

	burst	arrival rate	max packet size	latency	service rate	capacity
min	10 bytes	64 bps	128 bytes	$2 \mu s$	1 Mbps	256 Mbps
max	1024 bytes	1 kbps	128 bytes	200 ms	100 Mbps	256 Mbps

Table A.6: Parameters of the example Airbus network with size 120. The parameters of each flow and node is selected from the range uniformly randomly.

Per flow end-to-end delay bound

Unit in millisecond

Flow name	Panco-PLP	xTFA-TFA	Minimum (best)
f1	88.938	89.826	88.938
f2	15.224	15.224	15.224
f3	519.822	522.466	519.822
f4	850.189	855.111	850.189
f5	221.181	221.696	221.181

(a) Flow end-to-end delay (only first 5 flows)

Execution Time

Unit in second

tool-method	Execution Time
Panco-PLP	355.924
xTFA-TFA	6.163

(b) Execution time

Figure A.12: Example report from the topology of Figure A.11 with 120 randomly generated flows.